→ NATH



CT/PTO 29 APR 2005



PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the:
INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITY

INTERNATIONAL PRESIDENT EXAMINING AUTHORITY									
To:				L PCT					
Collison & Co		COLLI	CO & MOS	WRITTEN OPINION					
GPO Box 2		COLLI	COLLISON & CO.		•				
ADELAIDI	E SA 5001	- g			(PCT Rule 66) 8 SEP 04				
				Date of mailing	0 8 JUL 2001				
Applicant's or	agent's file refer		*************************	(day/month/year)	·				
54081PCT	mPoure (the 1010)			REPLY DUE	within TWO MONTHS from the above date of mailing				
International A	Application No.		International Filing Dat	te (day/month/year)	Priority Date (day/month/year)				
PCT/AU2003/001437 31 October 2003			31 October 2003		1 November 2002				
		• •	both national classifica	ation and IPC					
Int. Cl. 7	A42B 1/06,	1/02, 3/10							
Applicant		•							
NICH	IOLAS, Bedf	ord			•				
1 This will	····	he fixet de	be this Yets wetices	I Dalinia - F	in Andreite				
			wn by this Internationa	·	ing Authority.				
2. This opin	Basis of the o		ng to the following iten	ns:.					
п [-	Priority								
ш 🗀									
IV [
<u> </u>			: 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to	novelty inventive ster	or industrial applicability citations and				
V X Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicate explanations supporting such statement					or massim approximity, crassions and				
ντ	Certain documents cited								
VII	Certain defects in the international application								
VIII	Certain observ	ations on the inte	ernational application						
	3. The FINAL DATE by which the international preliminary examination report must be established according to Rule 69.2 is: 1 March 2005 (FINAL DATE 1/2/05)								
	icant is hereby	invited to reply	y to this opinion.						
When? See the Reply Due date indicated above. However, the Australian Patent Office will not establish the Report before the earlier of (i) a response being filed, or (ii) one month before the Final Date by which the international preliminary examination report mube established. The Report will take into account any response (including amendments) filed before the Report is established. If no response is filed by 1 month before the Final Date, the international preliminary examination report will be established the basis of this opinion. Applicants wishing to have the benefit of a further opinion (if needed) before the report is established should ensure that a									
How?	established.		least 3 months before the Final Date by which the international preliminary examination report must be itten reply, accompanied, where appropriate, by amendments, according to Rule 66.3.						
For the form and the language of the amendments, see Rul			f the amendments, see Ru	les 66.8 and 66.9.	weening to trule ou.s.				
Also For an additional opportunity to submit amendments, see Rule 66.4. For the examiner's obligation to consider amendments and/or arguments, see Rule 66.4bis. For an informal communication with the examiner, see Rule 66.6.									
Name and mai	ling address of t	ne IPEA/AU		Authorized Officer					
	N PATENT OFF		114						
PO BOX 200, WODEN ACT 2606, AUSTRALIA B-mail address: pct@ipaustralia.gov.au			Lin	JONATHAN MI	LLS				
Facsimile No. (02) 6285 3929				Telephone No. (02)	•				

Ø 040/043





WAITTEN OPINION

International application No.

PCT/AU2003/001437

I.	Basis of the opinion									
1.	With regard to the elements of the	regard to the elements of the international application:*								
	the international application	the international application as originally filed.								
	X the description, pages 1	-10, as orig in ally filed,								
	pages ,	filed with the demand,								
	pages ,	received on with the letter of								
	X the claims, pages 1	1,13, as originally filed,								
	pages 13	2, as amended under Article 19,								
	pages ,	filed with the demand,								
	pages ,	received on with the letter of								
	X the drawings, pages 1-	-6, as originally filed,								
	pages ,	filed with the demand,								
	pages ,	received on with the letter of								
	the sequence listing part of	the description:								
	pages ,	as originally filed								
	pages ,	filed with the demand								
	pages ,	received on with the letter of								
2.	Vith regard to the language, all the elements marked above were available or furnished to this Authority in the language in hich the international application was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item. hese elements were available or furnished to this Authority in the following language which is:									
		furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rule 23.1(b)).								
the language of publication of the international application (under Rule 48.3(b)).										
	the language of the translati and/or 55.3).	on furnished for the purposes of international preliminary examination (under Rules 55.2								
3.		regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application, the written opinion was a on the basis of the sequence listing:								
	contained in the international	al application in printed form.								
	filed together with the international application in computer readable form.									
furnished subsequently to this Authority in written form.										
	furnished subsequently to the	is Authority in computer readable form.								
	The statement that the subse international application as	equently furnished written sequence listing does not go beyond the disclosure in the filed has been furnished.								
	The statement that the information been furnished.	mation recorded in computer readable form is identical to the written sequence listing has								
4.	The amendments have resul	ted in the cancellation of:								
	the description,	pages								
	the claims,	Nos.								
	the drawings,	sheets/fig.								
5.	This opinion has been estab go beyond the disclosure as	lished as if (some of) the amendments had not been made, since they have been considered to filed, as indicated in the Supplemental Box (Rule 70.2(c)).								
* Replacement sheets which have been furnished to the receiving Office in response to an invitation under Article 14 are referred to in this opinion as "originally filed"										





International application No.

PCT/AU2003/001437

V. Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

	Novelty (N)	Claims	3,4,6,7,9-13,15-18	YES
		Claims	1,2,5,8,14	NO
	Inventive step (IS)	Claims	9,15,16	YES
		Claims	1-8,10-14,17,18	NO
Indus	Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	1-18	YES
		Claims		NO

2. Citations and explanations

The following documents identified in the International Search Report have been considered for the purposes of this report:

- DI US 4551858 A1 (PASTERNACK)
- D2 US 5557807 A1 (HUJAR et al.)
- D3 US 5539934 A1 (PONDER)

Novelty (N)

Document D1 discloses a helmet having a cooling harness held between an outer helmet and an inner, insulating, padded casing. The harness is a pouch of elastic material containing a coolant liquid. Claims 1,2,5,8 and 14 are therefore not novel.

Inventive Step (IS)

If the helmet of D1 were combined with a freezable gel as its coolant, as is common in the art and would be obvious to a person skilled in the art, it would disclose all the features of claims 3,7,10,12,13 and 14, which consequently lack an inventive step.

Document D2 discloses all the features of the claims 1-8, 10-14,17 and 18 with the exception that the article of headwear disclosed has its coolant pouch wholly enclosed in a padded pouch which is then removably fastened to the inside of the outer part of the crown. In consequence of this the coolant part is not strictly "intermediate" the inner and outer crown parts, but there is provided an inner crown part between the coolant pouch and the head of the wearer. This is considered to be a minor and non inventive difference between the document and the invention as claimed.

In contrast to document D2, document D3 discloses a helmet in which the coolant pouch is directly attached to the inside of the helmet and there is no inner crown part between the coolant pouch and the head of the wearer. This document is therefore not considered to render the claimed invention obvious.



Your Ref:

Please quote our reference Our Ref: 54081PCT PAB:JPH

23 December 2004

THE COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS WODEN ACT 2606

Madam

PCT Application No PCT/AU03/01437 COOLING HELMET NICHOLAS BEDFORD

Thank you for your First International Preliminary Exam Report dated 8 July 2004, in relation to the aforementioned PCT Application.

As such, please find attached a schedule of amendments, which replaces the original claims set. The claims defining the invention have been amended so as to distinguish the invention as claimed from the prior art citations.

Geoff E. Hubel 1.1 Dip.Mech Eng., M I E. Amt , G.P. Eng.

Howard K. Schulze 1.4 B Tech (Elec.) Notary Public

John M. O'Mahoney 1.1 B.Sc. (Chem.)

Dr. Donald I. Angus *
B.Sc. (Hons)
Ph.D. (Medicinal
Organic Chamistry)

Auristed by .

Anthony J. Norris *
B. Mgmt. (Hone)

Phillip A.Boehm 1.1 B Mech.Eng. (Hom)

Kevin McNamara 1.1 R E. (Elice & Electronio) MBA, MIP

'Registered Patent &
Trade Marks Attorney in
Australia and New Zoaland.

*Member/Fellow of the Implitu of Patent and Trade Mark Attorneys of Australia

²Registered Trade Marks Attorney in Australia. Independent claims 1 and 10 have been amended so that they now include the disclosure of 'an article of headwear including an impact resistant outer part of crown shape, and an impact resistant inner part of crown shape of a size and shape adapted to nest with the outer part.' The essential feature of an impact resistant inner part is not disclosed in any of the prior art citations.

Referring now to page 2 of the specification, where it is explained that: 'By structurally separating the crown of a headwear item into at least two parts with an intermediate part in between, provides an opportunity to control within a contained space arrangement for airflow and cooling effect, and distribution of cooling air from this.'

'Also, where there is an outer and inner part of an impact resistant material, this then allows for improved impact resistance by reason of a double wall characteristic which can then also mean that lighter materials may be used for at the individual parts which is to say lighter than would have been ordinarily needed for a single thickness crown to get a similar protective effect. This can assist in keeping an all up weight of a helmet within acceptable limits.'

Illeserver:Files:54081PCT NICHOLAS BEDFORD:54081PCT BEDFORD 23-12-04.doc
Patent and Trade Mark Attorneys

COLLISON & CO

→ NATH

Ø 037/043

141 1

We submit therefore that the invention as defined in amended Independent Claims 1 and 10 is novel and inventive, and that the remainder of the claims are novel and inventive also, by virtue of their successive dependencies on these claims.

In light of these amendments and comments, we respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider their reasoned statement, and allow the IPR to be established with a clear report.

Yours sincerely COLLISON & CO

PHILLIP BOEHM

Enç

Received: 4/26/05 2:04;
. 26/04 2005 16:19 FAX

COLLISON & CO

JC12 R PCT/PT. 2 9 APR 2005

PCT/AU2003/001437

WO 2004/039191

15

STATEMENT OF AMENDMENTS

1. Delete page 12 of the claims presently on file and substitute in place thereof new page 12 attached hereto.